The Candidature for the Presidency in eight years of Stephen A. Douglas. His selfishness, and the Duplicity in principle of his followers.

SPEECH

OF

GEN. BENJ. F. BUTLER,

IN

LOWELL,

AUGUST 10, 1860.

LOWELL:
ADVERTISER OFFICE—HILDRETH & HUNT, PRINTERS.
1860.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Friends of the Lincoln Financial Collection in Indiana

http://www.archive.org/details/candidatureforpr00butl

PROCEEDINGS.

At a call signed by a large majority of the Democratic City Committee, the Democracy of Lowell turned out, in overwhelming numbers, for the purpose of ratifying the nominations of Breckinridge and Lane for the Presidency and Vice Presidency.

The meeting was called to order by T. A. Crowley, Esq , Secretary of the Democratic City Committee, who read the following list of officers for the permanent organization of the meeting:

PRESIDENT:

PETER HAGGERTY, Chairman of Democratic City Committee.

VICE PRESIDENTS:

James C. Abbott,
David M. Collins,
John L. Rollins,
Harvey Silver,
E. A. Clark,
Willard Dudley,
H. L. Williams,
Oliver J. Conant,
Hugh McEvoy,
Charles French,
Holland Streeter,
William H. Clemence,
Otis Bullard,
Albert Wheeler,
George Molloy,
Hanover Dickey,
John P. Slocum,
James J. Maguire,
Thomas Ryan,
Levi Hedge,
David Campbell,
Dennis Lannan,
John Warren,
Samuel E. Convers,
P. J. Tobin.

SECRETARIES:

Charles Hunt, | Timothy A. Crowley.

The President, on taking the chair, made a brief and pertinent speech, introducing General Butler, who offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the National Democracy of the City of Lowell, in convention assembled, do ratify and affirm the nominations of Breckinridge and Lane as candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That while we deplore the disruption of the Democratic party whereby a portion has gone off to follow their leader in an attack upon our time-honored principles, in violation of its usages and customs, all of which we hold dear, and regret their departure, we cannot follow them even half way to the Republicans.

Resolved, That those who charge the National Democracy with being "disunionists" make a false accusation for political effect, and in answer to it we hereby again pledge ourselves to the Union and the Constitution, the equality of the States, and State Rights one and inseparable, forever to be guarded and preserved with more than filial devotion by loyal hearts and strong hands.

Resolved, That we will maintain our connection with the true Democracy of the Union; that we hold every one against us who is not for us; that we hold no union or communion with those who have gone away from those doctrines of the party which are essential to the preservation of the Union!

Resolved, That we cordially invite to co-operate with us, all Democrats and lovers of the Constitution and the Union, who prefer the success of our party, rather than the triumph of an individual; who love principles rather than men; who love their country rather than worship a chieftain.

ADDRESS.

Fellow Citizens:—It is pleasant again to meet you to give a further account of the trust confided to me.

Douglas' Nomination Impossible.

When we met before, undisturbed, I gave you my deliberate judgment that Mr Douglas could not be nominated as a candidate for the presidency. From the consequences that have ensued, I am pained to find that prediction verified. It will be our part to examine the causes which have led to the disastrous results of a divided party and conflicting principles, and to consult together as to what is to be done in the emergency.

What is our duty, as Democrats, animated with love of country, held by fealty to our party, and true to its time honored principles and usages? Let us calmly and dispassionately meet the issue presented to us, not occupying ourselves with unavailing regrets or useless moans at the unhappy state of affairs which call for our action.

Attempt to Overawe Delegates.

The occurrences at the Charleston Convention, I have related to you heretofore, and although that narrative has been published in every part of the Union, in no word or statement has it been successfully contradicted.

Mr PUGH, U. S. Senator from Ohio, in debate, ventured to interrupt Senator BENJAMIN, saying that there was no delegate from Ohio, at Charleston, opposed to Judge Douglas, in contradiction to my assertion that there were delegates so opposed. I am authorised by JUDGE BARTLEY, of Ohio, a delegate, to say that Mr Pugh knew he was opposed to Mr Douglas before they left Charleston.

Mr Pugh's is the only denial of my narrative that has come to my knowledge.

The ill-advised, not to say foolish withdrawal of the delegates from eight states, at Charleston, called for the adjournment at Baltimore. Immediately on that adjournment, the friends of Judge Douglas attempted to organize meetings in all parts of the country, and to call State Conventions, specially in the southern states, and by denunciations; by personal abuse of delegates; by traducing their characters; by impugning their motives of action and threats of popular disfavor, it was endeavored to coerce those who did not approve fully of the nomination of Douglas into his support at Baltimore. Of that kind of persuasion to change his course your delegate received his full share. A missionary was imported here from Minnesota who indulged himself in such political evangel to his heart's content, and was only prevented from the farther spread of the gospel, according to Douglas, by the pursuit of the Sheriff from our city for a just debt which he, in his zeal, had forgotten to pay. In this attempt to coerce votes there was a most signal failure. After six weeks of such canvassing of the country, not a single delegate, to to my knowledge, who voted against Douglas at Charleston, but went to Baltimore still more unalterably fixed in his opposition to him.

In the states of Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi and Louisiana, where State Conventions were called through the regular organization of the party according to Democratic usages, Mr Douglas failed to get a single delegate. Other unauthorized conventions met in some of the Southern states—called without right—held without precedent—attended by small minorities of all grades and sections of the opposition to the regular Democratic party of those states, from which delegates, who were not the choice of the party, were sent to Baltimore, not because they were Democrats, for many of them were not, but because they were Douglas men.

When we met at Baltimore the claims of these men to seats over the regular delegates, who, in all cases where conventions had been held, had been re-accredited to the convention, were submitted to the committee on credentials, from which were excluded eight states; states, too, where a Democratic electoral vote was as sure as any future event.

Bogus Delegates Admitted Favorable to Douglas.

The action of such a committee could not be doubtful—and therefore wherever any plausibility of right could be maintained, the regular delegates were excluded and these representatives of faction were admitted, and when there was not such show of right, half and half of each delegation was admitted; so that the vote of the state should be neutralized. In states where there were no contestants, as in Texas and Mississippi, the regular delegates were admitted by the report of the committee, although these delegates stood upon precisely the same grounds as those delegates who were rejected. No reason was given for the course of action by the report of the majority of the committee, and we are left to conjecture, save that we do know that the programme was arranged in the manner thought most favorable to Douglas, who I happened to know was daily and almost most hourly consulted as to the action of the committee, either personally or by telegraph, while the committee was in session.

Indeed so far was the question, whether a given delegate was for Douglas carried, that in the case of Mr Hallett of our state, and of a delegate from Missouri, who were kept at home by providential domestic sorrow and death, the substitutes in Charleston taking the places of their principals, the committee decided that the delegates could not have their own seats at Baltimore, but that the substitutes should retain them, and this, too, because the substitutes would and the delegates would not vote for Douglas. This report of the committee was adopted by the vote of New York, voting as a unit, and thus chaining 36 of her delegates who were opposed to Douglas.

A Majority of the States Withdraw.

Finding themselves disfranchised and their brethren deprived of their rights in a Democratic Convention, solely to foster the ambitious schemes of one man, every Southern State, by a majority of her delegates, withdrew from the Convention, together with Oregon and California. The President of the Convention left the chair, and from that time the rump of the Convention that remained could hardly be said to be an organized body.

It then became sectional, more so than the Convention at Chicago. It had of regular representatives only a minority of the States.—No question could be discussed in it. No one could obtain a hearing unless he would tickle the ear of the majority.

It then became my duty to act as in my judgment, the best interest of the Democratic party and the country required. Calmly and deliberately the decision was made, and I left the remains of a Convention, which, as then constituted, seemed to me capable of adopting any measure—assuming any form, subscribing to any principle, and committing any wrong that would advance the supposed interests of Mr Douglas. It was no longer a National Convention of Democrats, governed by a desire to advance the best interest of the party and the country—it was a camp of the followers of a chieftain seeking his personal aggrandizement. It was no longer a deliberative assembly of statesmen—it was in its majority a mob of Douglas men, and this is a sufficient antithesis!

Massachusetts Withdraws.

Nearly two-thirds of the Massachusetts delegation went out together, and for one, I can here declare that the only regret I have for what was done in that behalf, was the necessity which compelled my action, and I here further declare, that if the same series of events were again to occur, I would again do as I did before.

No man who saw the course of Mr Douglas and his friends as I saw and knew it, and as you will see and know it before I finish speaking, could do otherwise and maintain his self-respect.

Douglas Nominated by Resolution only.

The Douglas men then, after two unsuccessful ballots in attempts to nominate him, according to the usages of the party, and the

rules adopted by their own votes in violation of those usages and very rules, declared him by resolution the nominee for the Presidency.

No Democrat Bound by such Nomination.

By that nomination, so made, no man is bound, by the usages or principles of the Democratic party. It is not the nomination of a National Convention. The Convention had become sectional when it was made; it was not a Democratic nomination—it was carried by a violation of State rights in disfranchising Democratic Sovereign States. It was simply a Douglas nomination by the friends of Douglas of Mr Douglas as a Douglas candidate to make Douglas, President.

Resolution Against Popular Sovereignty.

After this nomination, a resolution was introduced by Mr Wickliffe, of Louisiana, which endeavored to bind the Democratic party to make such restrictions by the aid of all departments of Government upon popular sovereignty in the Territories as the Supreme Court have decided or may hereafter decide ought to be made.

This was unanimously passed without debate. They then nominated unanimously Governor Fitzpatrick, of Alabama, as candidate for the Vice Presidency, and adjourned.

I have been thus tedious in reviewing the history and giving the main facts of this Convention because I wish all my fellow Democrats to know and feel that they are not bound by these nominations as party men acting from party allegiance.

Whether as Democrats we are bound to vote for them from preference either for the men or the principles, let us now enquire.

Duplicity in the Nomination of Vice President.

As to Mr Fitzpatrick, we cannot vote for him, as he has declined, but he leaves behind him the question, why was he ever nominated?

He was a known opponent of the doctrine of popular sovereignty and non-intervention as explained by Douglas. He had made a speech against Douglas and his doctrines only a fortnight before. He had given no sign of repentance of that speech. Yet again I say he was unanimously nominated by a Douglas Convention—unanimously I say—when there was not a sober man in the Convention who did not know that he was hostile to every doctrine that Douglas enunciates upon the right of people in the Territories.

Mr Fitzpatrick had repudiated Douglas's construction of the Cincinnati Platform; he had rejected his explanation of the Kansas bill; he was opposed to Douglas on Lecompton; he voted for the Senatorial resolutions; the delegation to Charleston from his State were, by a vote of over 300 to 12, instructed to withdraw from that Convention if Douglas's doctrines were sanctioned by it. Why, then, the nomination? It was made to catch Southern votes by a false pretence that Douglas's doctrines were in accordance with Southern sentiment while his friends were courting the Republicans in the North.

It was made to show that a respectable Southern statesman could be found who would endorse Douglas and be associated with him.

But Mr Fitzpatrick, being a respectable gentleman and honest statesman, having something to lose, refused to run on the ticket, and would have instantly declined, but was prevailed upon to delay until the friends of Douglas in his State could advise with him.

But their advice and persuasion were useless. He could no more be persuaded to run upon that ticket, than I could be denounced into supporting it.

Nomination of Johnson, a Disunionist and Slave Trader.

Who, then, did these Douglas men, with their loud-mouthed cries of hatred of Southern fire-eaters and disunionists; of Southern rights; of Southern dictation; of Southern men and their present love of Republicans and freedom; take for a candidate for the second office in the Government of a great nation? Herschel Virgil Johnson. Tell me, my friends, how many of you had ever heard of him before his nomination. What services had he ever rendered the Democratic party or his country, to be entitled to this high honor. Tell me of his deeds, good or bad, known to you before that day. You are well read in current political history; there are some of you ardent friends of Judge Douglas; you ought to at least have heard of his second-best friend and the next best man

to be President, if Douglas should be elected and die, two events which I hope and believe are equally in the future. I inquired out Mr Johnson after I heard of his nomination, and I tell you what I learned of him. He is a respectable gentleman of considerable ability; too honest to pretend that he is a statesman. He is a disunionist. Has run as disunion candidate for Governor. He has declared in favor of the opening of the African slave trade. He made a speech in 1856 in Philadelphia, in which he said that "he thought it was the best plan for capital to own its labor." What say you to that, my laboring Douglas friends? He is in favor of Congressional intervention and protection of slave property in the territories, and made a speech for them within a month of the time when he was nominated to run on a ticket with a non-interventionist.

A Two Faced Ticket.

Hurrah for Johnson! he goes for intervention. Hurrah for Douglas! he goes for non-intervention unless the Supreme Court tells him to go the other way. Hurrah for Johnson! he goes against popular sovereignty. Hurrah for Douglas! he goes for popular sovereignty if the Supreme Court will let him! Hurrah for Johnson! he is for disunion! Hurrah for Douglas! he is for the Union, so he declares. Hurrah for Johnson! he is for the South! Hurrah for Douglas! he is for the North, at least he says so now.

The Committee nominated a ticket which is to be all things to all men, so that it may gain some.

But shall we support the nominee of the Convention for President? At a former time I told you why I ought not to vote for Mr Douglas as a candidate for the Presidency; now let me say to you why I will not support him when put in nomination by his friends.

Douglas tries to make himself President in '52.

First, then, in order of time, I find him in 1852 a candidate for the Presidency and forcing his candidature by appealing to the lowest motives, by resorting to a species of attack which had never before been used, at least, among gentlemen of the same party. Mr Cass, Mr Buchanan and Mr Marcy, were then attacked in a magazine under Douglas's auspices, edited by George Sanders, as "old fogies," and called upon to retire and give way to young America in the person of Mr Douglas, and through personal vituperation, strife and bitterness were engendered in the Democratic party only healed by the fortunate nomination of General Pierce.—Here was Douglas's first attempt to make himself President. It failed. The people make Presidents. When men can make themselves Presidents, then indeed, has the pride and glory of our country faded.

He brings Slavery Agitation in Congress in '54.

When the Democracy had carried that election for President with unequalled unanimity; when all parties had agreed to drop slavery agitation; when between North and South the bonds of Union were knitting stronger and firmer; when the Democratic party were in a majority in Congress from North and South; when the opposition to the successful administration of General Pierce was either silenced or broken in fragments and there was no hindrance to the country in her career of power and greatness, what was it, who was it, that changed all this? Who was it, for his own selfish purposes, that arrayed section against section; fanned into a blaze abolition agitation; "struck down as if by magic," to use the words of his Committee in their late address, "the Democratic party at the North," and armed brother against his brother's life on the plains of Kansas? The answer is the truth of God and History on my lips—Stephen A. Douglas!!!

He Repeals the Missouri Compromise to break down Pierce's Administration.

Grant the Missouri line was unconstitutional as we may all admit. Yet it was a matter of no practical importance at that point of time, and in course of litigation between party and party its constitutionality would have soon been declared by the Supreme Court, and the agitation in Congress in consequence of its disturbance have been saved to the country.

What is the history of this repeal of the Missouri Compromise? Was its repeal the long

thought of, carefully scanned measure of most importance weighed deliberately in the mind of a judicious statesman? Far from it. The truth of its history is this:—After Mr Douglas had from his Committee reported a bill for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska in the usual form of Territorial bills, and after, too, he had advocated the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, a Whig Senator from Kentucky remarked to him in substance, "Why don't you, Douglas, report a bill for the repeal of the Missouri line? Such a measure would be supported by the South and give you the lead of the administration." Douglas at once said "I will do it," and within forty-eight hours this measure of repeal was introduced as an amendment to the Kansas and Nebraska bill, uncalled for by the Southern Democracy, but which they were obliged to support, as it was right in itself and was advocated by its author as a measure in their favor, which would open equally all the territory of the country to the citizens of all the States for emigration with their property. A specious but fallacious argument, because it is utterly impossible from the very nature of slave property itself, that it should compete with the emigration from free States into a part of the country where free labor could be successfully carried on, and where the climate causes a suspension of agricultural labor for any considerable portion of the year. Still the measure was supported substantially by all Southern members of Congress, and was claimed by Douglas to be a boon to the South which he had given them.

He tries again to be President in '56.

For this he was burned in effigy, by the Republicans, for this he quarrelled with the 3000 ministers North, for this he claimed the support of the South in the Cincinnati Convention in 1856, on his second attempt to be President by a bid for Southern support.

The Administration of President Pierce having been brought into the support of this measure, and being conducted upon a strictly constitutional basis, commanded the respect of Southern Statesmen, and a growing distrust of Douglas prevented his receiving the votes in that Convention which he coveted, and they were then given to Mr Pierce.

The entire prostration of the Democratic party North, however, because of the evils which flowed from the Kansas bill, as plagues from Pandora's box, made Mr Buchanan a necessity and he was nominated.

His Strength but Sixty-three Votes.

In that Convention the actual strength of Stephen A. Douglas was sixty-three votes, and that number only. It is true that he got more than that number on the ballot when he withdrew, a withdrawal which is now claimed by him as a merit, but which was in fact a trick. It is no new thing for Mr Douglas to have votes thrown for him in a Convention which do not rightfully belong to him.

Douglas' Friends Entrap General Pierce's Friends into Voting for him.

On the evening of the 5th of June of the Cincinnati Convention, mark the date! the friends of Mr Douglas proposed to the friends of General Pierce that Pierce's name should be withdrawn, and the votes of Mr Pierce should be given for Mr Douglas, and that the "Little Giant" would continue the contest with Mr Buchanan until a compromise candidate could be brought forward acceptable to all as in the case of Mr Polk and Mr Pierce himself. In accordance with this understanding, on the morning of the 6th of June, the bulk of the friends of Mr Pierce (Mr Hibbard, of New Hampshire, having withdrawn his name) voted for Douglas, and thus swelled his vote to 122, the prior ballot having been 63 for Douglas and 75 for Pierce.

Douglas Deserts them to gain the Confidence of Buchanan.

Mark what followed! Upon the second ballot of that day being announced, Mr Richardson, of Illinois, produced what purported to be a telegraphic dispatch from Douglas dated June 4th. One day before any ballot for President had been had, withdrawing Douglas' name from the ballot because as the despatch read. "From the telegraphic reports in the newspapers I fear an imbittered state of feeling is being engendered." How so, Mr Douglas? Was any feeling shown before the balloting? We had adopted the platform unanimously on that very June 4th. We had settled the New York case to the acquiescence of both wings. How

could the telegraph, which took two days time to bring Douglas' dispatch to Cincinnati, carry the news of the ballotings to Washington the same number of days in advance of the fact? Was not the whole matter a ruse to bring in the friends of Mr Pierce to the support of Douglas, so that he might have the merit of withdrawing as the only competing candidate? I thought so then, I know so now, and a comparison of the dates which I have taken from the journal shows the fact. It was another exhibition of Parliamentary tactics, in behalf of Mr Douglas, not of the most honest kind for the purpose of personal advancement.

The election of 1856 came on, and again the Democracy triumphed—and again the Republican party seemed upon the verge of extinction, or at least of perfect subjection to the Democracy.

He Courts the Republicans to carry Illinois.

What new move will our Presidential aspirant make in the game of politics for his advancement? Will he still go South? No. He has now matter nearer home. His senatorial term is about expire as the administration of Mr Buchanan has just commenced its career. Kansas has framed a constitution, and is asking for admission to the Union. Peace will be given to the country and her bleeding wounds will be healed. It is necessary that something should be done to gain strength for himself in Illinois or Mr Douglas will lose his seat in the Senate. It is necessary that something should be done to check the prestige and popularity of the Democratic Administration because if it is a complete success; if nothing thwarts its course, if it gives peace to the country and all is quiet the people may demand the re-election of Mr Buchanan, and the glittering prize will be again removed too high for the short reach of the Little Giant.

To that end he Attacks the Admtnistration.

What will he do to break down this successful Democratic administration? Before the ink of the President's message to Congress was dry, without the usual courtesy of waiting for the printing, Mr Douglas began an attack upon the President and his policy, because it was too much in favor of the South. So the wind has now changed North! The Illinois election is coming on! What was the ostensible ground of the attack? It was that the President had recommended the admission of Kansas under such a constitution as her delegates had seen fit to adopt and send to Congress for her admission as a State.

In so doing he calls for Congressional Intervention in the affairs of Kansas.

Now, whether we agree to that Kansas constitution or not, and for one I did not, what was it the duty of the Little Giant of the great principle of "Squatter Sovereignty" to do with it? Why, simply to let it alone. It was the act of the people of Kansas, or, if it is claimed that it was forced upon them by fraud, still it was a fraud for their correction only. Congress had nothing to do with it, upon the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty. Yet, Mr Douglas claimed that Congress should intervene and override the organized action of the people of Kansas, and thus determine what was best to be done for them. If the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, the right of the people to manage their own affairs in their own way, means anything, it ought to have been applied then, if ever.

But, Mr Douglas upon this question joined hands with the Republicans and opposed the Democratic Administration, which desired to give peace to the country by the measure. If any Douglas man says the Democracy and Mr Buchanan were not right upon the Lecompton question, allow me, instead of giving my own opinion to read to you a part of a letter from an ardent Douglas advocate here, in Lowell, being the only one who took the trouble to go down to Boston and speak for Douglas at the Revere House, the other night. Here is the letter—

WASHINGTON, Feb, 20, 1858.

"HON. A. V. BROWN —Dear Sir:—As we were today speaking upon the subject of Kansas and its immediate admission as a State into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution, as made by the people of Kansas, through their legally constituted servants, in the exercise of their sovereignty guaranteed to the people by the Constitution and laws of the United States, I desire to say to you further, and I take this way to do so—that the only way in my opinion

to give peace to the country and justice to Kansas, is to admit her into the Union immediately, with the present Lecompton Constitution, upon the well taken ground of President Buchanan, set forth so nobly in his special message upon that subject to Congress, every line of which I fully endorse." * * * * * * * Signed, EDWIN A. ALGER.

He Aids the Republicans and seeks Aid from them.

Upon this measure I have said Mr Douglas went with the Republicans, nay more, he went farther, courted their support in the Illinois election, and the Republicans of that State found fault with their brethren of other States in that contest that they gave so much support and sympathy to Douglas. Still further, will any man, who knows anything about the facts, deny that a scheme was broached and discussed as to the policy of making Douglas an opposition leader and all the elements of opposition rallying under him. I call as a witness upon this a distinguished Senator of Massachusetts, to say whether at the time of the opposition of the Lecompton Constitution, Mr Douglas did not say in reference to his action with the Republicans, "I have ticketed my baggage clear through." If the Republicans would have received him, in my judgment Douglas would have gone with them, but his hopes were rather damped when he asked a sturdy old Senator what the Republicans thought of him [Douglas.] "Why," was the tart reply, "we look upon you as a pirate, who has put into our port in a stress of weather, and as soon as it is calm again, and you are refitted, you will be out preying upon us as before."

Have not his friends aided the Republicans in electing a Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives? Is not that same Clerk—Mr Forney—now his most available supporter in Pennsylvania? Does not he, a Republican, Clerk of a Republican House, through the columns of the "Press," dictate to the friends of Douglas in that State?

Does not Mr Burlingame say that he hails every Douglas flag as an ally to the Republican party? That Douglas has come over half way to the Republicans, and he expects him the whole way? In fine, does not Douglas himself say, in effect, in a recent speech, that he stands half way between the Democratic and Republican parties?

Indeed, he does stand there, like the Angel, the precursor of the seven plagues, told of in the Book of Revelation, "one foot on sea and one on solid land," holding out a little book of doctrine which, in the mouth, is the sweet honey of popular sovereignty, and in the belly, the bitter doctrines of Republicanism.

The Duty of Democrats.

To us, fellow Democrats, there is no half way. We are either Republicans or Democrats, if we act from principle. If we follow the fortunes of Douglas, we simply attach ourselves to a chief who, for twelve years, has labored simply for his own success, regardless of the good of his party, the triumph of his principles or the peace and welfare of his country. From the facts I have shown you, therefore, I could not, I cannot, I will not support his pretensions to the Presidency, which are sustained wholly by selfishness.

Breckinridge and Lane the True Representatives of Democracy.

What, then, shall we do? After the disorganization of the Democratic Convention, an almost unanimous majority of the delegates of the Democratic States met together and have recommended the names of BRECKINRIDGE and LANE as your candidates in the present canvass. To neither of them can any point and say that they ever did an undemocratic act, or swerved from a Democratic principle.

Soldiers both, they offered their lives in the cause of their country in Mexico, while the Senator from Illinois was enjoying popular favor and office, and intriguing for the Presidency at his ease at home.

The Charge of being Disunionists Answered.

Breckinridge has already filled the second office in the Nation with entire satisfaction to the whole people; is not that a guarantee that he is fit for the first? In all the strife; in all the investigations of the Republicans; in all the committees of enquiry or of accusation, what word of suspicion, even, has been breath-

ed upon the principles or acts of Breckinridge? Since his nomination, but never before, he has been called a Disunionist. In a speech but a day or two since at Frankfort, in the presence of his life long friends and political opponents, who could have gainsayed the declaration, if it were not true, he proudly said:—"I am an American and a Kentuckian, who never did an act or cherished a thought that was not full of devotion to the Constitution and the Union." Proud words, proudly spoken, and incapable of contradiction.

Southern Supporters of Douglas for Disunion and the African Slave Trade.

Yet we, who support this gallant and conservative leader, are called disunionists, and charged with being untrue to democracy. By whom is this charge made? by Pierre Soule, an avowed disunionist, in Louisiana; by John Forsyth and the "Atlanta Confederacy," in Georgia, which maintains the duty of the South to leave the Union if Lincoln is elected; and yet these same men are the foremost of the Southern supporters of Douglas; by Goulding, of Georgia, who is now stumping the State for Douglas, making the same speech that he made in the Convention at Baltimore, where he argued that nonintervention meant that Congress had no power to prevent the exportation of negroes from Africa, and that the Slave trade was the true popular sovereignty in full expansion.

Would you believe it, fellow citizens, that this speech was applauded in the Douglas convention, and that too by a delegate from Massachusetts, aye, and from Middlesex County.

When I left that convention, I declared that I would no longer sit where the African slave trade, made piracy and felony by the laws of my country, was openly advocated and applauded. Yet such, at the South, are the supporters of Douglas.

His Northern Supporters are Abolitionists and Disappointed Office Seekers.

Let us look at the political record of one or two, at the North, in our immediate neighborhood. I mean to say nothing of their personal characters or social position. These I treat with all respect, but with the political action of those who organize their followers* to break up our democratic meetings, and to read me out of the democratic party, I have something to do, and I propose to ask you as to their democracy.

I have already shown you that E A. Alger, Esq., has written a letter "endorsing every line" of Mr Buchanan's Lecompton policy, when he was an applicant for the Lowell Post Office, and is now going to Boston to make speeches for Douglas at the Revere House, as well as being a prime mover in the disturbances, the other night, in this Hall.

They take Oaths in a Secret League in a darkened room.

But what say you to this for democracy? Suppose a partially lighted upper chamber, around which certain gentlemen are sitting, in in solemn conclave; at one end is a raised dais, upon which sits the president, dressed in funereal black. Three slowly measured knocks are heard from without, answered by a like number within. A challenge is heard, and a sign is made, a pass word is given, and a hoodwinked gentleman is led in, and thus addressed:

PRESIDENT:—My Friend '—As an additional guarantee of your good faith, we desire your assent to an agreement which we have all taken, and intend faithfully to maintain. You will therefore place your right hand on your left breast, and repeat after me this agreement. Where I pronounce my name, you will pronounce yours, all speaking together, and distinctly:—

The Oath and Obligation.

AGREEMENT.—I, [Alpheus R. Brown,] in the presence of these witnesses, without hesitation or mental reservation, do solemnly pledge MY SACRED HONOR AS A MAN that I will not make known to any person or persons, any of the passwords, igns, secrets, mysteries, or objects of this organization, unless it be to those whom I shall know to be members of the same in good standing; that I will not communicate, by word, sign, or device, or in any way, directly or indirectly, any of the secrets or objects of the organization, to those not in good standing with it, nor suffer it to be improperly done by others,

* Referring to those who came into a former meeting and by yells and noises disturbed and broke it up.

if in my power to prevent it; that, so long as I am connected with the organization, I will in all things comply with the will of the majority, properly expressed, though it may conflict with my personal preference, so long as it does not conflict with the duty I owe my country, or the laws of the country under which I live; and that I will not knowingly recommend an unworthy person for membership. I furthermore promise and agree that I will give my unreserved influence, by word, act, and ballot, for the promotion of FREEDOM, TEMPERANCE, and PROTESTANTISM, without regard to party predilections, race, complexion, or condition in life; *that I will not, directly or indirectly, countenance the further extension of slavery;* and that, for the greater success of these purposes, I will not, under any circumstances, improperly expose the name of any member of this organization or reveal the existence of the same. To the foregoing, I pledge myself under no less penalty than of being expelled from the organization, and of having my name circulated throughout the different Leagues of the same, as one recreant to his word of honor and the best interests of the human race. And this is my agreement!—Brethren altogether solemnly ejaculate; and this is our *agreement!*

Can a gentleman who has taken this oath be a democrat? at least until he has made a public recantation and abjuration thereof? which Mr Brown never has done. Is such a man fit to take part in a democratic meeting? to read democrats out of the party? He is no democrat, and between us there is an impassable gulf. Let him go to the Republicans, where his principles will take him, and we will wish them joy of him. But such is a leading Douglas man here in Massachusetts. But let not the Republicans plume themselves too much on their acquisition, because after acting with the Secret League for months, a Democratic convention being about to be held, for the nomination of County officers, Mr Brown, by letter resigned his place in this league, made a speech complimentary to its action on Tuesday evening and on Wednesday morning was a candidate for County Treasurer in the Democratic Convention. We knew not of his secret oaths and associations. I learned the fact a few weeks ago, and have stated all this in Mr Brown's presence in the City Committee, and he did not pretend to deny it, or any part of it.

I commend the temperance part of his oath to the Whig rumsellers, who are now acting with him in the Douglas faction. I commend the antislavery part to Southern Douglas disunionists and the slave trader Gaulding. I commend the Protestant part to those Catholic Irishmen, who, with Mr Brown, claimed to vote me out of the Democratic Party the other night. There is in it food for reflection to all.

The waning hour and my failing strength, in this excessive heat, bring these remarks to an end. I had intended to analyze the Douglas platform, and the platform of the true democracy, and show the accordance of the last with time honored democratic principles, and the duplicity of the first—but at a future day I will meet you, and do myself the honor of fully discussing these questions.

At the conclusion of his speech, and frequently during its progress, General Butler was enthusiastically applauded.

Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, Jas. C. Abbott, Esq., being loudly called for, made a brief speech, wherein he demonstrated that the leaders of the Douglas faction were only Republicans in disguise, and were laboring for the success of Lincoln. His remarks were received with much applause.

The question on the Resolutions was then put, and they were unanimously adopted.

71.2009.084.00047